

THE SOUTHERNER.

and the remainder of the States and the Territories, and the District of Columbia are to expend theirs for the support of schools, or for other useful purposes.

The Southerner.

TARBORO: JULY 10.

FOR PRESIDENT,
FRANKLIN PIERCE.
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM R. KING,
OF ALABAMA.

FOR GOVERNOR,
DAVID S. REID.

"We would call the attention of our readers to the political articles on our first page. Gen. Scott's Letter of acceptance, we have not space to comment on. In our next, we shall publish portions of the Hon. R. Toombs' speech thereon, to inform our readers of the true state of feeling, with regard to the nomination, among all those who require some other claim to their support, than the mere name of Whig.

The article from the Savannah Republican, one of the leading Whig papers of Georgia, is also very pointed, showing clearly the degradation to which Southern Whigs have been subjected. Several other Georgia Whig papers have taken the same position, and as strongly oppose Scott.

The Land Bill has occupied the attention of Congress principally of late, and it will be perceived has passed the House. The Senate, it is believed, will certainly negative it. At least, we hope so.

Free Suffrage.

"A CONSERVATIVE."

We had wished to refrain from making any remarks in direct answer to the articles of "A Conservative." Yet, as in his last, which we publish to-day, he has laid on and spared not, we feel perfectly free to return the blows, and joyfully say "cursed be he, who first cries hold, enough."

Before answering directly this article, we will lay down in as definite terms as we can command, our own position, so that we may show in our answer how strictly consistent our editorial has been. That property should be represented, that it should be allowed such influence in all Legislatures, as to prevent its oppression, we believe to be a fundamental principle in Governmental economy. That it should have no more influence, we believe to be equally due to our personal rights. In accordance with this belief, we think the present division of Legislative power between the West and East—the West having control of the Commons, the representation in which is based simply on persons, and the East having the Senate, the representation in which is based wholly on taxation—gives property sufficient protection, independent of property qualifications for voters. That these far from being protectives of taxables generally, give to anti-interest which pays much less than half our taxes, the full control of the government, and thereby opens a door to unfair legislation. Not only so, but that this same interest, the landed interest, cannot be oppressed by any law that would not crush, aye, starve the indigent.

But, to the article. As the first paragraph relates to ourselves, we leave it to this article to vindicate us of the charges it contains. The second we will take more particular notice of. It refers to the action of the Conventions, and says, "there cannot be two opinions as regards the intention of the original framers of our State Constitution, and of those, who amended it in 1835, on the now mooted question, of whether property is entitled to representation, and consequently to protection." This protection it says is afforded by both the "basis of representation" and "land qualifications." It then gives a short account of the causes, which led to the Convention of '35, and winds up with the statement, "the right of suffrage as among white men remaining the same." Why did not "Conservative" here state, that it was forced to remain the same. He knew the Convention had no power to act on the question, why then attempt to make the people believe that it approved "land qualification for voters?" So far from it, he will find, if he examines "the Debates," that opinions were expressed strongly against it. Hear Nathaniel Macon, a faithful and worthy disciple of Jefferson:

"The President said, he did not approve of the land qualification for voters. Suppose two respectable neighbors had each a son, that one of them had 50 acres of land, perhaps not worth more than 25 cents an acre, and the other had no land, but was a good blacksmith or shoemaker, and his standing in society inexpressible, why will you al-

low one to vote, and not allow the other? If any qualification is necessary, he would prefer age; it is age that makes the man. He would rather take age than property."

"Conservative" also still persists in identifying "the basis of representation" and "land qualifications," and speaks of them as "the now mooted question." He surely knows that there were no two opinions in the Conventions of '76 and '35 on the right of property to protection or on the "basis of representation." He surely knows that on these, there is no difference between us. That we are as strongly for the "basis of representation" as he can be. He also surely knows that the now mooted question was not before the Convention of '35, and that to confound it with the "basis of representation," will be "apt to divert public attention from the true issue." And yet in the face of this knowledge, he will persist in mixing it, with every thing which he knows the people, and we as part of them, abhor. Why is it, if not for the reason, that what he advocates is too weak to stand without props? Its merits, if it has any, so flimsy that the light of experience and truth, shows their perfect worthlessness?

He next says, "If you expect to frighten the people into a support of free suffrage by holding up a Convention before them, you have less confidence in their intelligence than I have &c. The very same number of freeholders that can defeat the one, can the other." This last statement, though literally true, is intended to convey an idea far from true. The same number can, but will they? Is it not well ascertained that there are hundreds of free-suffrage men, who would vote against a Convention if free suffrage was adopted, who yet would advocate one rather than not have it? That there are many Western men, who will not now vote for free-suffrage, although in favor of it, because they believe if free suffrage is killed, they can join with the free suffrage men, and get a Convention? Why did Wm. H. Washington change his vote in the last Legislature? Why did Wm. B. Shepard advocate free suffrage? They were both opposed to it; but they said, that they knew the people were determined on having either that or a Convention? As to "frightening" the people, if a Conservative would not so vigorously spread his notes of dread, as to the direful consequences of "agrarianism," "abolitionism," &c., attempting thereby to humbug the people into the belief that they have some connection with the "real issue," there would never have been any necessity for such an argument, to Edgecombe Democrats; for there never was a measure more thoroughly republican, or one more universally cherished, since the overthrow of Federal mis-rule in 1801.

"A Conservative" next quotes from our editorials, to show that we are in favor of property representation. Surely we are, and we still believe every word he quotes. But we would ask him, where we ever said land needed special protection. We have frequently stated that it did not. It has its proportionate weight in the apportionment of Senatorial representatives, and we believe it should have that, yet it does not need it specially. Why? Because land is the foundation of every branch of industry. And we wish a "Conservative" to note, that so far from our saying anything against the landed interest, we do not believe, like himself, that it is the weak, puny interest of our country, which cannot be maintained without the strong arm of protective legal checks. We know that it is the foundation of all lasting prosperity, both physically and legally, that it is above protection, because the condition of every other interest, depends on it for its prosperity. Let the recent rapid advancement of Edgecombe, consequent on her progress in farming, testify for us here. It is equally true, that wherever extravagant systems of government prevail and the greater portion of its products are taken in taxes and tithes, the poor perish—that on its prosperity depend their lives, and that the last man who would advocate oppressive taxation on land would be the hand-to-mouth voter.

In the same paragraph, "Conservative" adopts our sentiment that property should only have as much representation as is necessary for its certain protection, and adds, "assuming that a majority of the voters for members of the House of Commons own little or no property, you cannot pretend that property will either be 'represented' or 'sufficiently protected' when the right to elect both branches of the Legislature is given them." Knowing that we did pretend to say property would be sufficiently protected if such should be the case, why did not a Conservative, here show us how it could be oppressed. If land can be oppressed by a law passed by the indigent, we should think that "Conservative" being an ex-legislator could surely manufacture one. We asked an anti-free-suffrage voter a few days since the same question. And we were really amused to hear him say, "Oh they would carry on a

splendid system of government, they would raise the taxes, and be always spending our money." We simply asked him, "under all extravagant governments, where taxes are high, even on land, who suffers?" He could but know that high taxes only curtail the rich man's luxuries, while they take from the poor man the very bread of life; and that the poorer the citizen the more he suffers. Under high British taxation, who perishes? Those who are too poor to pay taxes. In truth the only interest the poor man can have in legislation is to have taxes low, so that the profits of the property holders, out of which his wages come, and by the amount of which they must be regulated, may be as large as possible. These are well established facts. As then it is clear that the indigent cannot oppress land, and as you adopt the sentiment that it should have no more representative capacity than its protection requires, give up your opposition to free-suffrage, and cherish no longer at the expense of our personal rights your pride in this badge of exclusiveness and superiority.

"Conservative" next speaks of the cultivators of the soil as God's favored people. So we believe, and therefore we consider them, at least as free from the danger of oppression as others, and wish to get them out of the company of devil-approved monopolists, who are the only persons, whose prosperity can alone be preserved by special legal checks. He next speaks of the non-increase of land-tax and says, "this surely proves nothing of what the result will be, when your 'landless' lads shall elect the Senate, and a majority of it from the West." Here a Conservative would again thrust on the people the notion that it will give the West a majority in the Senate. A cause which needs such bolstering must be near its death. Does he not know that its influence will be in favor of the East, in favor of keeping the "basis of representation" as it is? If he does not we take pleasure in showing him that it will be. Who would be benefited by giving the West the power in the Senate? Who would be benefited by Rail Roads? The Western land-holders. Who is always oppressed by heavy taxes? The indigent. What would be the effect of the adoption of Western policy? High Taxes. Is it not therefore clear that it would be to the advantage of the Western non-land-holders, to cast their influence, if free-suffrage were adopted, against any change of basis? Think of this "Conservative."

Our comparison was intended to apply to the "Constitution," to show that in adopting free-suffrage, we made no alteration in its principles, therefore a "Convention" was clearly unnecessary. The quotation, we made, was from J. C. Calhoun. The next remarks of "Conservative" we willingly endorse. Also all he can say against such characters as Owen, Wright and others, with the simple proviso, that the free-suffrage men are not of them and cannot be made to associate with them. We are birds of a very different feather; and repudiate and scorn fanaticism as heartily as a "Conservative."

We will also cordially approve his appeal to the land-holders, if he will show us the least application. If he had advised them to study and toil for the natural improvement of their lands, he would have offered much better advice. By doing thus, we can tell them, that they will much more effectually preserve the land itself; and thereby receive the benefits of its "protective and conservative character," which has always entitled its owners to the noble appellation of God's favorites.

As we have never urged the last argument for free-suffrage which "Conservative" discusses, we pass it by. We think that it is the duty of every one to be ready and willing to fight for his country; and we also think it as justly the right of every one to vote for the officers of his government, unless some real, substantial reason can be shown why he should not. As to military chieftains, we see no objection to their being elevated to high civil offices, if they possess high civil, statesman-like capacity. But we do see great objection to a Candidate's running for the first office in the Republic, and at the same time retaining the command of the army. And we could but wonder why "Conservative" touched so lightly on this point. We hope his fondness for this badge of exclusiveness is not Whigging his whole political system. If it is, Good Lord preserve Edgecombe Democracy from the taint.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE SOUTHERNER.

Mr. Howard: Your commending to my special notice, your editorial of the 19th inst makes it proper for me to reply. In doing so, I shall allude to several of your editorials. Finding some little difficulty in following you through your windings and doubts singly, I shall treat you as two persons; or as one having two sets of opinions, or principles, "one for show, the other for use."

Possibly the best reason that can be given for Editors assuming the plural form of expression is, that they intend to take the liberty, as occasion requires, of acting at least, two characters. If you do not claim this prerogative, allow me to inquire, if it indicates who is "the great apostle of your faith?" You are presumed to know, and ought to recollect, that a certain "Northern man with Southern principles," who had taken "both sides," upon almost every important political question, which had engaged the public attention, during some twenty years, was very popular with the Democratic party, from 1830 to 1840. Now whether in hunting for some "book on Government," to prove that property is not entitled to representation, you might not have stumbled upon some of his "oracles." I pretend not to know. As you play both characters, as best suits your convenience, I shall reply to both, without discrimination; but you will be able to know, "the from tother."

There cannot be two opinions, as regards the intention of the original framers of our State Constitution, and of those who amended it in 1835, on the now mooted question, of "whether property is entitled to representation," and consequently to protection. By both "the basis of representation," and "the right of suffrage," the representation of property is made a cardinal consideration. I have not referred for years to the proceedings of the Legislature which called the Convention in 1835, nor to those of the Convention, but my recollection is so distinct on the subject, that I will venture to state from memory, the prominent facts in relation thereto. The Western people had been dissatisfied with "the basis of representation," for a great while, but no dissatisfaction was expressed, or believed to exist, either in the West or East, about the right of suffrage. The Legislature of 1834-5 passed an act to call a Convention, if a majority of the qualified voters desired it, which was responded to, in the affirmative. The Convention, among other amendments, made a change in "the basis of representation," and although by said amendment the East lost political power, said its majority in the House of Commons; yet it more clearly recognizes the principle, that property is entitled to representation, than did the original. The right of suffrage, as among white men, remaining the same; what support can you obtain for your favorite, by a reference to those proceedings? Nothing, unless you can divert the public attention from the real issue. In this you will find yourself mistaken, for however popular this "free-suffrage" question appeared to be two and four years ago, whilst politicians had charge of it; depend upon it, "the people" have taken it in hand now, and the politicians may stand aside, and await their determination. Whatever that may be, whether for "weal or woe," being in a minority has no terrors for me. I was not afraid of the popularity of Genl. Jackson, when he possessed most—when I was in a minority of some—perhaps fifteen or twenty, of the whole County of Edgecombe, in the days of South Carolina nullification, the Proclamation and Force Bill; and I am not likely to fear Gov. Reid and his followers.

I have lived (thank Heaven) to see a majority of Edgecombe in favor of State Rights again—in favor of secession or nullification, for less is not State Rights; and of course opposed to the doctrines of the Proclamation, &c.; and I trust, before a Senator from Edgecombe is required to vote on the "free-suffrage" question, I shall find a majority of those, whose privilege it is to elect him, opposed to it.

So far as the election of Governor is concerned, I care not a straw about it—it is too late to make that an issue; that should have been done four years ago. And if you expect to frighten the people into a support of "free-suffrage," by holding up a "Convention" before them, you have less confidence in their intelligence, than I have, and therefore should be more opposed to "free-suffrage" than I am. The very same number of freeholders, that can defeat the one, can the other—a fraction over one third; so all we have to do, is to be true to ourselves, true to one another, and defeat either or both, whenever, by whomsoever, and for what purpose-soever brought forward. Courage, comrades!

Sir, I shall not despair of having one of you on my side, for you can say very good things, in favor of the Constitution as it is, and the right of property to representation. Yes say "the advocates of the measure" ("free-suffrage") do not wish to deprive property of its representative capacity." Good! Again, "While we believe, that the representation of property should be a fundamental principle in governmental economy, we as firmly think, that like every other interest, independent of personal rights, it should command no more consideration, than just enough for its certain protection. Why? Because of the vast superiority of man over property. The simple question therefore arises, would free-suffrage leave property sufficiently protected? If so, we are for it; if not, we are against it." Better! Again, "Shall we thrust aside the wisdom of our sages, and uproot the long established, time-honored principles of republicanism? The principles of our Constitution are just and wise, their execution well provided for. In this respect there is not a better." Best!! Assuming that a majority of the voters for members of the House of Commons, own little or no property, you cannot pretend that property will either be "represented" or "sufficiently protected," when the right to elect both branches of the Legislature is given them. You must therefore abandon free-suffrage."

But then the tother of you, says so many hard things of free-holders! Calls us "aristocrats," "royal hontentots," and "monarchs," because we think with his other self, that property is entitled to protection, and must be represented to obtain it. You admit that the existing Constitution and legislation under it, can do "no particular harm," th minority interests are not oppressed; still

you contend "that only sectional or local interests need independent protection," and defy the production of any "book on government" to prove the contrary. The plain free holders, myself among them, are not very well read in "books on government," but we have read that great "book" which is open for every man who knows from experience, observation, cause and effect, that an identity of interest is necessary for the success of those, in whose hands are placed the reins of government. Was the sage of "Monticello" right in the opinion, that if God has a favorite people, they are those who cultivate the soil? Here lands are cheap and within the reach of every man of property, and is that property, which furnishes the best evidence in its owner, of having "an abiding, permanent, common interest." What class of persons, therefore, so safe, so trustworthy as the land holders? I boldly answer none under Heaven! You say "the land tax has not been increased one per cent." since 1835. If true, why? Because the election of the Senate is made, not only by land holders, but Eastern land holders elect a majority of it. This surely proves nothing of what the result will be, when your "landless" lads shall elect the Senate, and a majority of it from the West. This same fanciful, showy chap, says he "cannot bear the fancy cut of his coat," or shake with hearty good will his "colored kids." This he intends to apply either to land holders, or figuratively to the Constitution which they so much admire. I candidly confess, that he is so incorrigible, that I do not believe I shall ever make any thing of him. He does not seem to know, that many of the free holders, only wear coats to keep them warm, caring nothing about the "cut," so that it does not "cut" change too short; and as to "colored kids!" why the sober one of you must watch him better; he doubtless had been to the wrong "shop." He has made a total mistake; free holders don't wear them! Merchants and tailors, preachers and schoolmasters, doctors and dandies, Lawyers and editors wear them. You call my attention to a "quotation," "the production of one of the greatest statesmen," and whom you deem "the great apostle of your (my) faith." If I could see the context, it might alter my opinion of the "quotation," but as at present understood, I can by no means adopt it as orthodox. If it emanated from Jefferson or Calhoun, not otherwise, you are right in believing them my "leaders," although I do not adopt all of their opinions.

Sir, we have too much government; the General Government encroaching upon the rights of the States, and the State Governments interfering with the rights and duties of individuals. Whatever powers were reserved to the States and the people, can, not only be best exercised by the respective States, but as there is no concurrent jurisdiction, it is clearly a violation of the Federal Constitution, and an encroachment on the rights of the States, for the former to exercise any such powers. The State Governments on the other hand, should take charge of, and regulate all such matters, as are reserved to them, which the people cannot better manage themselves individually.

But in these days, when Radicals, Socialists, Agrarians, Free-soilers, Free-suffragemen and Abolitionists, destructives, and of the same family, though of different degrees of relationship; both Governments move out of their proper orbits. Robert Dale Owen, Fanny Wright, Brownson and others have taken a hand, in the attempt to upturn society and convert property into a common stock concern; thereby discouraging industry and economy, and offering a premium to idleness and dissipation. Brownson through the columns of "The Democratic Review," of which he was editor, I think, (it has been some twelve years, since I read it) boldly advocated the propriety of abolishing the marriage tie and negro slavery—of putting down all Banks, and of making the State the owner of all private property, after the death of each owner, respectively. There are those who contend "that all men by nature, are entitled to land," as well as the right to control property and taxation, regardless of the fact, that they have no property. Others again contend for the rights of women and negroes; Fred. Douglas and other gentlemen, with certain ladies, in Convention assembled, resolved "that all persons, without distinction of sex or color, are entitled to equal rights." Under the influence of this tremendous outside pressure, no wonder if Congress shall give to the poor, the public lands, and the States in the attempt to make all their people equal may divide the private lands.

Now sir, I am going to talk it through you, right into the freeholders. What one among them, whose filial gratitude is of the proper measure, who would not feel disgraced, if from improvidence and mismanagement, he were to permit his parental estate to "suffer detriment"—destruction at his hands? I say parental, for in the accumulation of an estate, it is not unfrequently the case, that the mother contributes largely thereto—not in making, but in saving, which in the end amounts to the same thing. I repeat, what son can take a retrospect through the years of his minority, of the toil, industry and economy of his parents, in providing him an estate, although small—a home of his own, where he can live independent and happy, "under his own vine and fig-tree, with none to molest, or make him afraid," without gratitude to them, and a determination on his part, that it shall "suffer no detriment at his hands," if in his power to prevent it. If you are thus grateful and determined, what shall I say of the character of that obligation which is imposed on you, to see that "the State suffers no detriment at your hands?" Remember the toils, sufferings, and privations, not only of your parents, but of the host of patriots and statesmen, by whom our existing institutions, have been formed and preserved; and say if it is not reason in you to suffer—no matter from whom, or under whatever pretext—such alterations to be made in them, as will forever deprive them, of their safe, protective and conservative character?

I feel no more interest in this matter than any of you should feel. I apprehend no danger to myself during the small remnant of time, which remains for me; but I do pray you to leave one spot in the confederacy, where property—the reward of industry—shall be protected, against the fearful combinations, which exist against it.

I have recently heard it gravely insinuated, as a reason why the proposition before us, for the extension of the right of suffrage, should be adopted—"that all men who vote for their country, should be allowed to vote in the Senate." It appears fortunate for our country that we have volunteers in sufficient numbers, for all fighting purposes, where required; there is therefore, no compulsion no age at which any one has been engaged to fight for a long time; none from this State have been coerced since 1815. Volunteers only, and at the call of a Government, in which all who have the right of voting for "members of the most numerous branch of the Legislature," have free suffrage, in the election of President and Vice President, members of the House of Representatives and nearly an equal share in the election of the Senators to Congress. Moreover, the fight for a government which protects the persons and property too, if they have any, from foreign aggression and insult—a government which feeds, clothes and pays them, while thus employed. But the State may call for her sons to defend her, and therefore they should have "free-suffrage," it may be said. Well it is sufficient at present, they will not answer the purpose, as men unused and fight too, if necessary from eighteen, to those, who are twenty-one years old, &c.

I said it appears to be fortunate for our country, that our people are so willing to fight; but it may prove unfortunate. There is a growing disposition for conquest, and too much partiality manifested for military men. We have had four conspicuous military men for Presidents of the U. S., and this significant fact, that the administrations of three of them, more or less tended to consolidation, and the consequent usurpation of the rights of the States. The other had not time allowed him, to prove what his administration would have been, but there can be no doubt, as to what the result would have been, as respects the consolidation tendency of it. He had approved of Genl. Jackson's Proclamation and Force Bill. Yet all the were patriots, and that was fortunate for the country. Should an ambitious tyrant, great military fame, ever be elected to the Presidency, whose patriotism shall not be sufficiently strong, to resist temptation, was an admiring, war-loving people to back his liberty may mourn the occurrence. This is not the present aspect of things.

June 30th, 1852. A Conservative

FOR THE SOUTHERNER.

THE FOURTH—CELEBRATION, &c.

The Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was celebrated by our cities with more than usual enthusiasm. At the break, all the bells pealed forth their note of rejoicing, that the natal day of our national freedom had in the revolution of the year again dawned upon us. At sunrise, a salute of 13 guns was fired under the direction and supervision of John Nordcut, Esq. Notwithstanding the extreme heat of the day, (I have often observed that the 4th of July is the hottest day of the year,) before the hour designated for forming the procession, a large number of people had come in from the rural districts, a goodly portion of whom—thanks to our revolutionary mothers—were ladies, unite their voices and commingle their efforts with ours, in commemorating the great event that has marked the progress of the world.

At half past ten the procession was formed in the Court House square, under the direction of Marshal Powell & his two efficient Subalterns (Messrs. Phippen and Saunders.) The Boys and Cadets of Temperance in regalia headed the procession, inspiring all by their example with a reverence for their holy mission. The procession marched, in good order to the Church, which by this time was nearly filled with the patriotic daughters of old Edgecombe. The building proved in adequate to accommodating the large concourse, consequently a large number were forced to take positions outside.

The Declaration of Independence was read by Mr. John L. Williams, after which George Howard Jr. Esq. pronounced an eloquent and interesting oration upon the nature and progress of our institutions, advancing to the conflict between the advocates of States Rights and Consolidation, and ending with a just and glowing tribute to the virtue and inestimable worth of woman in her relationship to society. The address was historical, throughout with very marked attention.

At the close of the oration, Peter P. Lawrence, Esq. in pursuance of the wishes of the Washington Monument Association, requested all there who might feel so inclined to contribute to the Monument Fund. There not learned the amount of the contributions. The procession then re-formed under escort of the Marshal, and having marched to the Hall of the Sons of Temperance, disbanded. As is customary one gun was fired at the close of the reading of the Declaration, and at the close of the oration; and at 12 o'clock was fired for each of the Sovereign States in the Union, now numbering thirty-one. A single gun was fired at sunset.

In the evening, there was an extensive display of fire-works on Main Street which was brilliantly illuminated from one end to the other. I was much reminded of "the fireworks" in our principal cities, twinkling with their myriad gas-lights. To H. B. Bryan Esq. is due the credit of this new feature in our national celebrations. He but pronounced the decree—"let there be light," and "there was light." Not less novel and interesting